



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/828,607	04/06/2001	Slobodan Vukicevic	STK/070	5821
1473	7590	06/08/2004	EXAMINER	
FISH & NEAVE 1251 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS 50TH FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10020-1105			ROBINSON, HOPE A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1653	

DATE MAILED: 06/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/828,607

Applicant(s)

VUKICEVIC ET AL.

Examiner

Hope A. Robinson

Art Unit

1653

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 April 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27,30-34,47-50 and 57-60 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-27,30-34,47-50 and 57-60 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on April 22, 2004 has been entered.

Claim Disposition

2. Claims 28-29, 35-46 and 51-56 have been canceled. Claims 1 and 47 have been amended. Claims 1-27, 30-34, 47-50 and 57-60 are pending and are under examination.

3. The following grounds of rejection are or remain applicable :

4. The amendment filed April 22, 2004 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because the amendment introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: the independent claims for example, claims 1 and 47 recite "inducing the formation of functional permanent cartilage tissue" and there is no support for this in the instant specification, see for example on pages 3-4. The new material introduced is the "permanency" as the instant specification does not provide support for

Art Unit: 1653

"inducing the formation of functional permanent cartilage tissue". Further, the response does not point to support in the instant specification for this language, however, presents statements that the amendment distinguishes the claimed invention from the art. Therefore, there is no support in the instant specification for the added language recited in the claims.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 1-27, 30-34, 47-50 and 57-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The claims recite added material, which is not supported by the original disclosure. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: the independent claims for example, claims 1 and 47 recite "inducing the formation of functional permanent cartilage tissue" and there is no support for this in the instant specification, see for example on pages 3-4. Further, the response does not point to support in the instant specification for this language, however, presents statements that the amendment distinguishes the claimed invention from the art. Therefore, there is no support in

Art Unit: 1653

the instant specification for the added language recited in the claims. Thus, the specification lacks adequate written description

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103 (c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102 (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a).

7. Claims 1-6, 7-25, 27, 30-34 47, 48, 57 and 59-60 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Luyten et al. (WO 96/143335, May 17, 1996) taken with Celeste et

Art Unit: 1653

al. (WO 95/126035, June 15, 1995) and Cui et al. (Ann. Otol. Rhinol. Laryngol. vol. 106, pages 326-328, 1997) .

Luyten et al. disclose cartilage-derived morphogenetic proteins having *in vivo* chondrogenic activity (CDMP-1 (GDF-5 or MP-52) and CDMP-2 (GDF-6)) in combination with a matrix, for example, freeze dried cartilage, collagen, hydroxyapatite, polylactic acid, polyethylene glycol, for the repair of cartilage such as subglottic stenosis, tracheomalacia, chondromalacia patellae, osteoarthritis, joint surface lesions (see claims 1-4, 7-11, 14-16, 25, 27, 47, 48, 57 of the instant application and page 2, lines 10-11; page 3 lines 4-23 and page 4 lines 21-36 of the reference). Luyten et al. teach that the CDMPs can be combined with a number of suitable carriers such as fibrin glue, cartilage grafts and collagens (see claim 14 of the instant specification and see page 19, lines 17-29). The reference also teach that the formulation can be administered via an injection (see claims 59,60). Luyten et al. do not teach the agent carboxymethylcellulose. However, Celeste et al. teach a pharmaceutically acceptable vehicle or carrier such as collagen, poly(lactic acid), polymers of lactic acid and poly(glycolic acid) and agents such as carboxymethylcellulose (see claims 1, 19, 25, page 16 and 19). Celeste et al. also teach bone morphogenetic proteins useful in treatment of tendon or ligament defects such as induction and repair (see page 326) and that BMPs are useful in the formation of bone, cartilage and tendon, for example BMP-12 (see page 1 of the reference).

In addition, Cui et al. teach the repair of thyroid cartilage defect with bone morphogenetic protein by administering bBMPs for the replacement of lost laryngotracheal cartilage which results in new bone formation. Cui et al. teach that cartilage was initially formed but eventually gave room to new bone. Cui et al. differs from the claimed invention in that the replacement tissue which is formed is not functional cartilage, but bone (see claims 1-6, 8-18, 20-25, 27, 30-34). However, Cui et al. teach that the ideal way to a repair laryngotracheal defect is by inducing replacement cartilage growth.

Art Unit: 1653

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the claimed invention as a whole by combining the teachings of the references because all the references teach BMPs for inducing replacement growth of defects in cartilaginous tissue. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine the references because Cui et al. teach that the ideal method for replacing lost laryngotracheal cartilage would be to induce growth of host replacement cartilage that would bridge an entire defect by means of a cartilage-inducing implant. Moreover, Cui et al. teach that laryngotracheal defect is a serious and difficult problem since it causes laryngotracheal stenosis and Celeste et al. teach that BMPs are useful for the induction or repair of bone, cartilage and tendon. Thus, the claimed invention was obvious to make and use at the time it was made and was *prima facie* obvious.

8. Claims 1-6, 8-25, 27 and 30-34 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Cui et al. (Ann. Otol. Rhinol. Laryngol. vol. 106, pages 326-328, 1997) in view of Celeste et al. (WO 95/126035, June 15, 1995).

Cui et al. teach the repair of thyroid cartilage defect with bone morphogenetic protein by administering bBMPs for the replacement of lost laryngotracheal cartilage which results in new bone formation. Cui et al. teach that cartilage was initially formed but eventually gave room to new bone. Cui et al. differs from the claimed invention in that the replacement tissue which is formed is not functional cartilage, but bone (see claims 1-6, 8-18, 20-25, 27, 30-34). However, Cui et al. teach that the ideal way to a repair laryngotracheal defect is by inducing replacement cartilage growth. In addition, Celeste et al. teach bone morphogenetic proteins useful in treatment of tendon or ligament defects such as induction and repair (see page 326). Celeste et al. teach that BMPs are useful in the formation of bone, cartilage and tendon, for example BMP-12 (see page 1 of the reference). Celeste et al. also teach a pharmaceutically acceptable vehicle

Art Unit: 1653

or carrier such as collagen, poly(lactic acid), polymers of lactic acid and poly(glycolic acid) and agents such as carboxymethylcellulose (see claims 1, 19, 25, page 16 and 19).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the claimed invention as a whole by combining the teachings of the references because both references teach BMPs for inducing replacement growth of defects in cartilaginous tissue. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine the references because Cui et al. teach that the ideal method for replacing lost laryngotracheal cartilage would be to induce growth of host replacement cartilage that would bridge an entire defect by means of a cartilage-inducing implant. Additionally, Cui et al. teach that laryngotracheal defect is a serious and difficult problem since it causes laryngotracheal stenosis. Moreover, Celeste et al. teach that BMPs are useful for the induction or repair of bone, cartilage and tendon. Thus, the claimed invention was obvious to make and use at the time it was made and was *prima facie* obvious.

9. Applicant's response filed April 22 , 2004 has been considered. Note that a ground of rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, has been instituted based on the introduction of new matter into the claims as stated above. The induction of functional cartilage is supported by the instant specification, however, the new material introduced is the "permanency" as the instant specification does not provide support for "inducing the formation of functional permanent cartilage tissue". The amendment to the claims (see for example claims 1 and 47) forms the basis of applicant's arguments of non-obviousness over the prior art. Applicant's statements on pages 11-16 have been considered, however, as the phrase "permanent" which applicant intended to distinguish the instant claims over the prior art introduces new matter, the rejections of record have been maintained and applicant's comments are not deemed persuasive. Therefore the

Art Unit: 1653

references by Luyten et al., Celeste et al., and Cui et al. remains relevant to the claimed invention for the reasons set forth above.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new/modified ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. No claims are presently allowable.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Hope A. Robinson whose telephone number is (703)308-6231. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00 A.M. to 6:30 P.M. (EST).

Art Unit: 1653

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor Christopher S.F. Low, can be reached at (703) 308-2932.

Any inquiries of a general nature relating to this application should be directed to the Group Receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Papers related to this application may be submitted by facsimile transmission. The official fax phone number for Technology Center 1600 is (703) 308-2742. Please affix the Examiner's name on a cover sheet attached to your communication should you choose to fax your response. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG (November 15, 1989).

Hope A. Robinson, MS 

Patent Examiner


CHRISTOPHER S. F. LOW
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600